

### **REMARKS**

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments sufficiently distinguish from the prior art and place all of the claims in the application in condition for allowance.

As of the Office Action dated August 3, 2005, the parent application included fourteen independent claims, namely, claims 1, 24, 35, 43, 44, 46, 52, 59, 62, 64, 66, 80, 86 and 87. Of these, independent claims 24, 35, 43, 46, 52, 59, 64, 66 and 80 had either been allowed or indicated as being allowable. Independent claims 44, 62, 80 and 87 which were rejected in view of prior art in the Office Action of August 3, 2005 have been cancelled. Accordingly, with the above amendments, the only independent claim in the case, other than those which have been allowed or indicated as being allowable, is independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 has been amended to require the internal side wall to be “substantially parallel to said longitudinal axis of the dental implant at the point of engagement between said internal side wall and said circumferential collar”. Further, independent claim 1 has been amended to require this internal side wall to extend “in a direction substantially parallel to said longitudinal axis of the dental implant from said point of engagement toward said second end”. These limitations define the structure by which the impression cap is retained relative to the implant and clearly distinguished the present invention from each of the prior art references. In the present invention, this is shown best in Figures 6 and 7 in the area where the surface 46 engages the outermost diameter of the collar 16. Note that the surface 46 is parallel to the longitudinal axis at the point of engagement with the collar 16 and that such surface 46 also extends in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the implant for a distance toward the second end.

In *Hurson* (2002/0106610), as best shown in Figures 7a, 7b and 8b, this internal surface at the point of contact with the outermost diameter of the shoulder or collar 47 of the abutment (Figure 8b) is generally V-shaped with a distal portion 134, an apex 136 and a proximal portion 138 (page 6, paragraph 0089). Thus, not only does *Hurson* fail to include an internal surface at the point of contact with the outermost diameter of the shoulder which is parallel to the longitudinal axis of the implant, it also fails to show or disclose this internal surface extending in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis from this point of engagement toward the open end of the impression cap.

In *Halldin* (2003/0082499), there is no engagement between the impression cap and the implant at the outermost diameter of the implant collar. Instead, the bottom, angled edge of the impression cap terminates at or above the outermost diameter of the collar. The impression cap is retained relative to the implant via the internally extending rib 209 (Figure 7d) which engages a corresponding groove in the implant.

*Grande* (6,068,478) is similar to Hurson in that the bottom end of the impression cap (see Figure 1G) is provided with a V-shaped groove to fit over the outermost diameter of the implant collar. In fact, all claims of *Grande* require the lower end of the impression cap to be provided with a gripping means for gripping an undercut contour of the dental implant. Thus, this structure necessarily must include the generally V-shaped groove and accordingly fails to disclose a structure in which the internal surface is substantially parallel at the point of engagement and in which the internal surface extends in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the implant from such point of engagement toward the open end.

It is respectfully submitted that with these amendments, all claims are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

In the event the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding the amendments or the references, she is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to expedite the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Customer Number 25763

Date:

Jan. 3, 2006

By:

David N. Fronek

David N. Fronek

Reg. No. 25,678

(612) 340-2629